BIOLIFE

RESEARCH ARTICLE

SCARAB (SCARABAEIDAE) FAUNA OF SINDHUDURG DISTRICT, MAHARASHTRA, INDIA

D. L. Bharamal¹., Y. J. Koli^{2*}., D. S. Korgaonkar³ and G. P. Bhawane⁴

^{1,3} Department of Zoology, Shri. Panchamkhemraj Mahavidyalaya Savantvadi 416 510. MS, India ²Department of Zoology, Sant Rawool Maharaj College, Kudal 416 520. MS, India. ⁴Department of Zoology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur- 416 004, MS, India.

E-mail: dryjkoli@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Efforts were made to study the dung beetle of Sindhudurg district during 2009-10. During the survey and collection 26 species and distributed over 17 genera belonging to 6 subfamilies of dung beetle were reported. Subfamily Scarabaeinae was dominant with 14 species followed by subfamily Rutellinae, Dynastinae, Melolonthinae, Cetoniinae and Aphodiniinae with 4, 3, 3, 1 and 1 species respectively.

Keywords: Scarab, Sindhudurg, fauna

INTRODUCTION

The dung beetle family Scarabaeidae has a worldwide distribution with some 27,800 described species (Cambefort, 1991; Jameson and Ratcliffe, 2005). Dung beetles play an important role in many ecological processes, especially in nutrient cycling and fertilization and aeration of soils, but also in seed dispersal and the dynamics of some parasite species (Andresen, 2002; Mittal, 1993).

The diversity of local dung-beetle communities is primarily influenced by vegetation cover, soil type and moisture, and resource (dung) availability (Doube 1986, Davis 2002). Since dung beetles have different preferences for dung of different mammals based on texture, of the dung-beetle communities is influenced by the local mammalianfauna.

The review of literature suggests that 89 species of dungbeetle were previously recorded for the

state of Maharashtra (Jadhav, 2012), 96 species for the Madhya Pradesh (Chandra, 2000), Chandra and Ahirwer (2007) and Chandra (2013) published a comprehensive account of scarabaeid beetle of Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh and recorded 124 species.

In Indian subcontinent literature on dung beetle stared with listing of species by Arow (1910, 1917, 1931), Chandra (1986,1999), Gupta (1986), Chandra (2000, 2003), Chandra and Ahirwer (2007), Chandra and Singh (2010) presented comprehensive list of dung beetle from different region of India.

Geographical information (Table 1):

The Sindhudurg district comes under Konkan zone and lies between 15037' North to 1640 North latitude and 73019' East to 74013' East longitude. The total area of the district is 5087.5sq. km. The forests in the district cover an area about 409.06 sq.km under the Forest Department, out of which 285.45 sq.km in

D.L. Bharamal et al Copyright@2014

Savantvadi and Kudaltalukas and 12.61 sq.km in remaining talukas. The district is surrounded by Ratnagiri district in the north Sahyadri hills and beyond Sahyadri, Kolhapur district, the state of Goa in south and Arabian Sea towards the west. Physiographical this area is rugged and complex one. The height of the region varies from sea level up to 1300 m.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

A beetle were collected manually from cattle pastures, mostly for fecal deposits and the adjacent surface soil in areas of Vengurla, Kudal, Kankavli, Savantwadi and Amboli region during 2009 to 2010. The beetles were collected directly by forceps from dung. The collected specimens were pinned and transferred to the Department of Zoology, Shivaji University Kolhapur for species identification and comparing them with deposited specimens.

Table-1. Geographic coordinates of collection localities in Sindhudurg District

Collection localities	Latitude (N)	Longitude (S)	Altitude (ft)
Vengurla	15°51'00.48"	73°37'56.15"	56
Kudal	16 ⁰ 00'29.19"	73°41'13.31"	98
Sawantwadi	15°54'19.32"	73 ⁰ 49'16.65"	374
Kankavli)	16°16'31.76"	73°42'23.65"	136
Amboli	15°57'46.62"	73°59'52.14"	2352

RESULTS

The study revealed that of 26 species belonging to 17 genera and 6 subfamilies of Scarab beetle from Sindhudurg district.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

Scarab beetle fauna of Maharashtra was studied by Jadhav (2012). Bhawane*et al.* (2012) reported

Table -2. The diversity of dung beetle in Sindhudurg District, Maharashtra, India as recorded in the present study.

Family	Subfamily	Species
Scarabaeidae	Ruteliinae	Adoretuslobiceps Arrow, 1931
		AnomalabengalensisBlandchar, 1851
		AnomalabiharensisArrow, 1917
		MimelamacleayanaVigors, 1825
	Cetoniinae	AnthracophoracruciferaOlivier, 1789
	Aphodinae	AphodiushaafiPetrovitz, 1961
	Melolonthinae	Apogonia sp.
		Maladeracastanea, Arrow
		Maladeraholosericea, Scopoli
	Dynastinae	Oryctes rhinoceros Linnaeus, 1758
		Phyllognathus Dionysius Fabricius, 1792
		XylotrupesgiedonLinnaeus, 1767
	Scarabaeinae	Brahminacrinicollis
		Brahmina sp.
		Catharcius molos sus Linnaeus, 1758
		ChilolobaacutaWiedemann, 1823
		ChilolobaacutaWiedemann, 1823
		ChilolobaacutaWiedemann, 1823
		HelicoprisbucephalusFabricius, 1775
		<i>Holotrichiafissa</i> Brenske
		HolotrichiakarschiBrenske
		OnitisphilemonFabricius 1801
		OnitisfalcatusWuifen, 1786
		OnthophagusagnusGillet, 1925
		OnthophaguscattaFabricius 1787
		OnthophagusdamaFabricius 1798

D.L. Bharamal et al Copyright@2014

152 species under 101 genera belonging to 25 families of beetles, they concluded family Scarabaeidae to be dominant with 65 species from Amba Reserve Forest, Western Ghat, Kolhapur. Bhawane et al., (2013) inventoried 55 species from Kolhapur district. But information on dung beetles of Sindhudurg district has been very poorly studied and very few species are reported. In the present study 26 species belonging to 17 genera and 6 subfamilies were reported (Table 2). The subfamily Scarabaeinae dominated with 53.84 % of the total species recorded, followed by the subfamily Dvnastinae Ruteliinae 15.38 %. Melolonthinae11.53 % each and Cetoniinae and Aphodiinae 3.84 %.

After this faunal study of dung beetle it can be concluded that, factors such as afforestation, mining, human interference and litter accumulation are adversely affect on dung beetle population, which will be major component of food web. Thus, appropriate management of harmful ecosystem is of key importance for the conservation of dung beetle assemblages.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors express their sincere sense of gratitude to Department of Zoology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur and Principal and Head, Department of Zoology, Shri Pancham Khemraj Mahavidyalaya, Sawantwadi, for providing laboratory facilities and for encouragement during the completion of the work. We thank the forest department of Sawantwadi Taluka for granting permission to work in forest area.

REFERENCES

- 1. Andresen, E., 2002. Dung beetles in a Central Amazonian rainforest and their ecological role as secondary seed dispersers. Ecol. Entomol. 27, 257–270.
- 2. Arrow, G.J. (1910). *The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma*. Col. Lamell. I (Cetoniinae&Dynastinae). Taylor & Francis, London, V-XIV, 1–322.
- 3. Arrow, G.J. (1917). The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma. Col.

- Lamell. II (Rutelinae). Taylor & Francis, London, V-XIII, 1–387, 7 fig., 5 pls.
- 4. Arrow, G.J. (1931). *The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma*. Col. Lamell. III, (Coprinae). Taylor & Francis, London, XII: 1–428, 61 fig., 19pls., map.
- 5. Bhawane, G.P., Gaikwad, S.M and Mamlayya, A. B (2013): Studies on biodiversity of Scarab beetles of Kolhapur district, India. Biodiversity Monitoring and Utilisation, Pointer publication, Jaipur, 296.
- 6. Bhawane, G.P., Mamlayya, A. B., Wagh, S. R. and Chaugule, A. K. "Diversity of white grub beetles and their host range from Northern Wesetern Ghats, Kolhapur District (M.S.) India." *The Bioscan*7, no. 4 (2012): 589-596.
- 7. Cambefort, Y., Hanski, I., 1991. Dung beetle population biology. In: Hanski, I., Cambefort, Y. (Eds.), Dung Beetle Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton,pp. 36–50.
- 8. Chandra, K. & S.C. Ahirwar (2007). Insecta: Coleoptera: Scrabaeidae, *Zoological Survey of India*, *Fauna of Madhya Pradesh* (*including Chhattisgarh*), *State Fauna Series* 15(Part-1): 273–300.
- 9. Chandra, K. & S.P. Singh (2010). Scarabaeid beetles (Coleoptera) of Achanakmar Wildlife Sanctuary, Chhattisgarh. *National Journal of Life Sciences* 7(1): 71–74.
- 10. Chandra, K. (1986). Taxonomic studies on PleurostictScarabaeidae (Coleoptera) of North-West India. PhD Thesis. Faculty of Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, 251pp, plate 28, map 14.
- 11. Chandra, K. (1999). Annotated check-list of Aphodiinae (Scarabaeidae: Coleoptera) from India. *Records of the Zoological Survey of India* 97(Part-2) 87–108.
- 12. Chandra, K. (2000). Inventory of scarabaeid beetles (Coleoptera) from Madhya Pradesh, India. *Zoo's Print Journal* 15(11): 359–362; http://dx.doi.org/10.11609/JoTT.ZPJ.15.11.3 59-62
- 13. Chandra, K. (2003). Insect biodiversity in Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh, Advancements in Insect Biodiversity (edited by Rajiv Gupta), Agrobios (India): 37–52 & 325–337.

D.L. Bharamal et al Copyright@2014

14. Chandra, Kailash and Gupta, Devanshu. "Scarab beetles (Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea) of Barnawapara Wildlife Sanctuary, Chhattisgarh, India." *Journal of Threatened Taxa* 5, no. 12 (2013): 4660-4671.

- 15. Davis, A.L.V., Scholtz, C.H., Philips, T.K., 2002. Historical biogeography of scarabaeine dung beetles. J. Biogeogr. 29, 1217–1256.
- 16. Doube, B.M., 1986. Biological control of the buffalo fly in Australia: the potential of the southern African dung fauna. In: Patterson, R.S., Rutz, D.A. (Eds.), Biological Control of Muscoid Flies, Miscellaneous Publications of the Entomological Society of America, College Park, Maryland, USA, pp. 16–34.
- 17. Gupta, A.K. (1986). Studies on Dung Beetles (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Laparosticti) of North-West India. PhD Thesis. Faculty of Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, 251pp+24pls.
- 18. Jadha, M. J and Sharma R. M (2012): Insecta :Coleoptera : Scarabaeidae (Scarabaeid beetles). *Zool. Surv. India Fauna of Maharashtra, State Fauna Series*, 20(Part-2): 489-494.
- 19. Jameson, M., Ratcliffe, B., 2005. Generic Guide to New World Scarab Beetles. UNL State Museum–Division of Entomology. Mittal, I.C., 1993. Natural manuring and soil conditioning by dung beetles. Trop. Ecol. 34, 150–159.
